

## Charges Against Nixon

## Found Lacking in Merit

### Impeachment

(Editor's Note: The following letter, written by Laguna Beach resident William O. Mincher, was recently sent to Carl Albert, speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C.)

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Before staging that Bloodless Coup d'etat (impeachment) being demanded by the liberal extremists in both houses of Congress and elsewhere, don't you agree, they should bear in mind that the people in the U.S. are a little more sophisticated, politically, than our counterparts in Latin America, where such things happen frequently?

Our people are going to be damned hard to fool, to say nothing of the possible disastrous repercussions. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is your responsibility to warn these irresponsible extremist characters of the possible consequences of their actions.

Sure, these extremists will probably have the full support of the three irresponsible TV networks, the New York Times, Washington Post and the Daily Worker, none of whom echo the voice of most of the hardworking, taxpaying citizens.

Mr. Speaker, should we lynch the President, just because he has a poor "TV image", too trusting with a few top aides, authorized an investigation of a traitor and ended the Vietnam war, bringing our POW's home, resulting in the embarrassment to some of our liberal extremists?

Lets examine and weigh some of the more frequent charges against the President:

1. Attempted bugging of Democratic headquarters. There has been absolutely no proof presented thus far, that the President had any knowledge of the act. Furthermore, no intelligent person would believe that the President is that stupid.

2. Wrong doings of top Aides. Yes, the President is obviously guilty of being too trusting, when engaging top aides and advisers. Is that a crime?

3. Campaign contributions. No proof has been presented to show that the President has personally accepted any illegal campaign funds or made any illegal deals with contributors. His election committee's practice seems to be no different from the regular practice of the Democrats except the amounts were a little larger. The Country would really be shocked with the revelations of the illegal contributions received by the Democrats from such sources as the AFL-CIO and other big Unions. I would venture to say most of our liberal extremists in both houses of congress would be in jail.

4. Tax deductions. Yes, I would say the President is guilty of tax deductions for donations of his vice-presidential papers, which he has already acknowledged, but nothing illegal. The same thing can be said about Hubert Humphrey, Lyndon Johnson, ex-governor Edmund G. Brown, to name only a few.

5. Landslide Victory. Probably the biggest crime committed by the president, in the eyes of the left-extremists, was his over-whelming victory in 1972. They refuse to accept it and are frustrated. They have no real issues, so they are building up Watergate, as a target to run against in 1976 and future elections.

Regardless of the outcome of the affair, Democrats will be running against Watergate for the next 20 years. Just like Roosevelt and Truman ran against the Hoover Depression for a similar period of time.

Listed above is only a few of the most frequent charges against the President. It would require several books to list them all. As a matter of fact, the president would have had to have a thousand doubles in order to be able to commit all the crimes he has been charged with in relation to Watergate.

So, in the best interest of our Country, may I suggest that you advise your colleagues and the Left-extremists that they either launch their planned coup quickly or shut-up. We have had enough!

354

## Humphrey Denies Donation from Hughes

WASHINGTON (AP) — Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, D. Minn., has denied under oath that he personally received a \$50,000 cash contribution from the Howard Hughes organization during the 1968 presidential campaign.

Humphrey made the denial in a court-ordered deposition taken in his office Tuesday in which he replied to a series of written questions prepared by attorneys for Hughes and cross-questions submitted by lawyers for a former Hughes aide, Robert A. Maheu.

The deposition will be entered as evidence in a civil trial scheduled to begin next week in Los Angeles.

Maheu said in sworn testimony last summer that he delivered \$50,000 in cash from Hughes to Humphrey while the two men sat in a limousine in front of a Los Angeles hotel in the fall of 1968. Humphrey was vice president at the time.

Maheu has charged that Hughes libeled him during a 1972 telephone news conference by inferring that Maheu had stolen money while supervising Hughes' hotel and gambling operations in Las Vegas, Nev.

In a counter-suit, Hughes contends Maheu misappropriated some funds entrusted to him, possibly including the \$50,000 he says he passed to Humphrey.

Humphrey has acknowledged meeting Maheu in July 1968 at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles during a Humphrey fund-raising event in which Maheu participated.

But the senator denied that he had received an attache case from Maheu either then or any other time.

One of these gentle  
is a liar!

Why has not the Dep  
of Justice or the  
Watergate Committee  
investigated, or cou  
it be that Democrats  
are immune?

....purjury, right?

Airtel

9-18-74

To: SAC, Los Angeles <sup>EX-105</sup> REG-7

1 - Mr. [REDACTED] *etc*

From: Director, FBI *74-2509*

*f*  
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY  
OO: LA

Enclosed for each office is a copy of a memorandum from Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice dated 9-10-74, in which request is made of the FBI to conduct a preliminary investigation into a possible Perjury violation committed by either Senator Hubert H. Humphrey or Robert A. Maheu, former aid to Howard Hughes in connection with an on-going civil libel suit.

As requested by the Department, Los Angeles should obtain copies of those portions of the statements given in depositions or testimony in connection with civil libel suit captioned "Maheu vs Hughes Tool Co., a corporation, Byoir and Associates, a corporation, and Richard Hanna, No. 72-305HP," in United States District Court, Central District of California, relevant to the \$50,000 contribution involved.

The Department has advised that the preliminary investigation requested should be limited at this time to the obtaining of the above documents. Interviews of persons involved are not requested at this time.

Los Angeles should submit LHM and include as enclosures to the LHM copies of documents obtained.

Senator Humphrey has been advised that an investigation into this matter has been initiated.


Enclosure

1 - WFO (Information) (Enclosure)

SEE NOTE PAGE TWO...

Assoc. Dir. \_\_\_\_\_  
Dep. AD Adm. \_\_\_\_\_  
Dep. AD Inv. \_\_\_\_\_  
Asst. Dir.:  
Admin. \_\_\_\_\_  
Comp. Syst. \_\_\_\_\_  
Ext. Affairs \_\_\_\_\_  
Files & Com. \_\_\_\_\_  
Gen. Inv. \_\_\_\_\_  
Ident. \_\_\_\_\_  
Inspection \_\_\_\_\_  
Intell. \_\_\_\_\_  
Laboratory \_\_\_\_\_  
Legal Coun. \_\_\_\_\_  
Plan. & Eval. \_\_\_\_\_  
Spec. Inv. \_\_\_\_\_  
Training \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone Rm. \_\_\_\_\_  
Director \_\_\_\_\_

*etc* *dmj* (5)  
*146*  
**53 SEP 26 1974**



MAIL ROOM ☐ TELETYPE UNIT ☐

*etc*

*etc*

359

Airtel to SAC, Los Angeles  
RE: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

*l7c*  
NOTE: Department Attorney Edward Lowenberg, General Crimes Section, advised Supervisor [REDACTED] on 9-17-74 that the preliminary investigation requested by the Department should be limited at this time to obtaining copies of pertinent portions of testimony and depositions given by Senator Humphrey and Maheu regarding the \$50,000 contribution involved in this matter. He stated it was not necessary to conduct any interviews at this time.



FBI

Date: 10/3/74

Transmit the following in \_\_\_\_\_  
(Type in plaintext or code)

via AIRTEL

AIRMAIL

(Priority)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (74-245) (P)

RE: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY  
OO: Los Angeles

Re Bureau airtel to Los Angeles dated 9/18/74.

Enclosed herewith for the Bureau are six copies of a letterhead memorandum (LHM) pertaining to a preliminary inquiry into this matter. Enclosed for Washington Field is also one copy of the same LHM.

The enclosed LHM describes the testimony given in this trial, and the depositions taken, as being massive. The testimony consists of a 12,000 page transcript and according to the Court Reporter, SAM GOLDSTEIN, testimony pertaining to the \$50,000 contribution is interwoven throughout the trial. Mr. RICHARD W. JOHNSON, Court Clerk, U.S. District Court, Los Angeles, advised that at the request of STEPHEN E. HABERFELD, Assistant Special Prosecutor, Watergate Special Prosecution Force (WSPF), Washington, D.C., a copy of the testimony and depositions relevant to the \$50,000 contribution were furnished to Mr. HABERFELD.

- 2 - Bureau (Enc. 6)
- 1 - Washington Field (Enc. 1)
- 2 - Los Angeles

67C  
(5) rge

ENCLOSURE

OCT 7 1974

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Special Agent in Charge

Sent \_\_\_\_\_

M

Per \_\_\_\_\_

OCT 25 1974

360

LA 74-245

From the remarks made by Mr. JOHNSON (above) it would appear that the WSPF is in possession of the pertinent documents which Mr. HENRY E. PETERSEN desires. Further, it would appear that WSPF is also considering the possibility of perjury.

Before pursuing this matter further at Los Angeles, it is suggested that the Bureau discuss this situation with WSPF to determine if in fact that office does already have the information desired by Mr. PETERSEN which would, of course, save a vast amount of Agent time in obtaining the data which is already in their possession.

No further action is being taken by Los Angeles at this time pending further advice from the Bureau.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Los Angeles, California  
October 3, 1974

In Reply, Please Refer to  
File No.

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY

On September 30, 1974, Sam Goldstein, Court Reporter for United States District Judge Harry Pregerson, Central District Of California, advised that the first phase of the case of Maheu vs Hughes Tool Company, Et Al (Case Number 72-305HP) has just been concluded after several weeks of testimony. He stated that this phase concerned the liable aspect of the case and a verdict was rendered in favor of Maheu. He stated that in about a week the trial will resume and testimony will be introduced in connection with the final phase, the damage phase.

Mr. Goldstein advised that during this trial Robert A. Maheu testified under oath for several days during which time much of his testimony related to political contributions. Maheu testified that he gave a political contribution of \$50,000 to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in 1968 while they were seated in a limousine in front of the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California. Goldstein stated that Mahue testified to this contribution several times during the time the trial was in progress, and further, the matter was testified to by several witnesses who observed the two men together at the Century Plaza Hotel but did not observe any exchange of money or briefcase. In addition, several depositions were taken in which this contribution was also mentioned.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

74-209-2  
ENCLOSURE

368

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY

Mr. Goldstein advised that as he recalls testimony regarding this political contribution is interwoven throughout the trial transcript and he would be unable to extract the testimony relating to this subject matter from the transcript of the trial. He described the material (transcript of testimony and depositions) as being massive. He explained that the testimony alone consists of 12,000 pages and would cost 40¢ a page for him to produce it.

On October 2, 1974, Richard W. Johnson, Court Clerk for U.S. District Judge Harry Pregerson, Central District of California, Los Angeles, California (688-3433), advised that the trial of Maheu vs Hughes Tool Company, Et Al, will resume in about a week to pursue the issue of damages. He stated that the trial pertaining to the liable aspect of the case took 71 days and involves about 40 volumes of testimony and numerous depositions. The subject of political contributions was one aspect of the trial and Robert A. Maheu testified that in 1968 he gave Senator Hubert H. Humphrey a briefcase containing \$50,000. Maheu also testified that this transaction took place in Senator Humphrey's limousine as it was parked in front of the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles. He stated that testimony relating to the transaction was interwoven throughout the trial and is not conveniently located in any one particular section of the transcript. He stated many depositions were taken in pretrial, as well as during the trial, and some of these depositions also contain statements regarding the \$50,000.

Mr. Johnson advised that he has furnished Robert Muse, Attorney for Senator Irwin's Special Committee on Watergate, with a transcript of some of the testimony relating to the \$50,000 contribution. Also, he received a request from Stephen E. Haberfeld, Assistant Special



SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY

Prosecutor, Watergate Special Prosecution Force,  
Washington, D.C., for a copy of the testimony and  
depositions relevant to the \$50,000 contribution. He  
stated all of this material has been furnished to Mr.  
Haberfeld.

At this time, Mr. Johnson furnished the  
following copy of the deposition given by Senator  
Hubert H. Humphrey:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT A. MAHEU,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HUGHES TOOL COMPANY, a  
corporation, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil No. 72-305-HP

**FILED**

FEB 26 1974

HUGHES TOOL COMPANY, a  
corporation,

Counterclaimant,

vs.

ROBERT A. MAHEU,

Counter-Defendant.

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
BY *[Signature]*

Washington, D. C.  
Tuesday, February 19, 1974

Deposition Upon Written Questions of

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

a witness, called for examination by counsel for defendant and

FRIEDLI, WOLFF & PASTORE  
919 18TH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

PHONES: NA 8-3181  
NA 8-3582

365

counterclaimant Summa Corporation (formerly Hughes Tool Company) pursuant to notice, copy of which is attached to the court copy of this deposition, at the offices of Hubert H. Humphrey, Room 232, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., beginning at 3:05 o'clock p.m., before George Correia, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, when were present on behalf of the respective parties:

For the Deponent:

O'CONNOR & HANNAN  
BY: JOE A. WALTERS, ESQ.  
845 Northwestern Bank Building  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

--o0o--

C O N T E N T S

WITNESS:

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

DIRECT

3

CROSS

5

--o0o--

Thereupon,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

a witness, was called for examination by counsel for defendant and counterclaimant Summa Corporation (formerly Hughes Tool Company) and, after having been duly sworn by the notary, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT  
AND COUNTERCLAIMANT SUMMA CORPORATION

BY MR. CORREIA:

Q State your name and address.

A Hubert H. Humphrey, Room 232, Russell Building,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Q Were you a candidate for any public office in the  
United States during the year 1968?

A Yes.

Q What office?

A Candidate for Presidential nomination of the Democratic  
National Party; later candidate for the Presidency of the  
United States of America.

Q Are you acquainted with Robert A. Maheu, the Plaintiff  
in the above-captioned action?

A I am acquainted with him.

Q Did Robert A. Maheu ever personally deliver to you any  
amount of money at any time during the year 1968?



A No, never to me personally. However, he may have made a contribution to one or more of the committees supporting first my candidacy for the Presidential nomination and later my candidacy for President of the United States.

Q During the year 1968, did you personally receive any amount of money from Robert A. Maheu, or any individual other than Robert A. Maheu, who you believed to have been then acting on behalf of Robert A. Maheu or Howard R. Hughes?

A No, not personally. However, a contribution may have been made to one or more of the committees supporting me in the 1968 campaign.

Q In a deposition taken in the above-captioned action, on July 4, 1973, Robert A. Maheu testified, in substance, that some time during the 1968 Presidential Campaign, immediately after a speech which you delivered at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California, he met with you in your limousine in front of the hotel and personally handed to you \$50,000 in cash. On the basis of your own knowledge and recollection, is the above-described testimony of Mr. Maheu correct and accurate as to the matters stated?

A At some time in 1968, during the course of my campaigns, I recall being at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, but I was never personally handed \$50,000 in cash

by Mr. Maheu or anyone else.

Q If your answer to Question 9 is in the negative, please identify each aspect of the referenced testimony of Mr. Maheu which is not correct or accurate and describe the manner in which it fails to be in accord with your own recollection of the pertinent facts.

A I recall being at the Century Plaza Hotel during the 1968 campaigns and I recall having met Mr. Maheu at a fund-raising dinner at the Century Plaza Hotel. I do know for sure that I never personally received \$50,000 from Mr. Maheu.

EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF AND COUNTER-DEFENDANT

BY MR. CORREIA:

Q During your 1968 Presidential Campaign, did you appear at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California, to deliver any speeches?

A Yes.

Q If so, state the dates and occasions on which you so appeared at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California?

A I do not have an independent recollection of the date or dates I appeared at the Century Plaza Hotel, but according to what available itinerary schedules I do have for 1968, it appears that I was at the Century Plaza Hotel on

July 10, 11, 27, 28 and 29, and September 24, all in the year 1968. The occasion for my being there was as part of my campaign for the nomination and the candidacy for President of the United States.

Q Do you recall meeting Mr. Robert A. Maheu in front of the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California, during your 1968 Presidential Campaign?

A I do recall meeting Mr. Maheu in front of the Century Plaza Hotel during my 1968 Presidential Campaign.

Q If you do recall meeting Robert A. Maheu in front of the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California, during your 1968 Presidential Campaign, state the date, who was present, and what was said and by whom, to the best of your recollection.

A To the best of my recollection, I met Mr. Maheu on July 29, 1968. On that occasion there were present my wife, well wishers, supporters, United States Secret Service Agents, members of my staff, whose names I do not recall.

The substance of the conversation between myself and Mr. Maheu was that he wanted to wish me well and to be of help. My reply, in substance, was that I thanked him for his offer of support in my bid for the Presidency and for participating in the fund-raising reception that evening.

Q Do you recall Robert A. Maheu delivering an attache case to your automobile in front of the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California, during your 1968 Presidential Campaign?

A I do not recall Mr. Maheu delivering an attache case to the automobile in which I was traveling in front of the Century Plaza Hotel during the 1968 Presidential Campaign. No attache case was delivered to me and, to the best of my knowledge, no attache case was delivered to the automobile in which I was traveling during any time that I was in the motor vehicle.

Further, if an attache case was delivered to my motor vehicle at a time when I was not present, I did not subsequently become aware that any attache case was in the motor vehicle.

Q If you do not recall Robert A. Maheu delivering an attache case to your automobile in front of the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, California, during your 1968 Presidential Campaign, do you deny that such a delivery was made or do you simply not recall such a delivery?

A I cannot deny that such a delivery was made. I do know that no attache case was ever delivered to me personally.

Q Do you recall Robert A. Maheu delivering an attache case or other similar container to you or your representative on any occasion?



A No attache case or other similar container was ever delivered on any occasion to me by Mr. Maheu nor, to my knowledge, to any representative. I have no way of knowing whether or not an attache case or other similar container was delivered to any one of the representatives of the committees supporting me during my 1968 Presidential Campaign.

Q If you do not recall Robert A. Maheu delivering an attache case or similar container to you or your representative at any time, do you deny that such a delivery was made or do you simply not recall such a delivery?

A I deny that any delivery of any attache case or similar container was ever made to me and I have no knowledge of such delivery ever having been made to my representative.

However, as I have stated before, I have no way of knowing whether or not such a delivery may have been made to a representative of the committees supporting my nomination and later my candidacy for President in 1968.

Q Did you or anyone on your behalf maintain records of cash contributions during the 1968 Presidential Campaign?

A Neither I, nor any of my personal representatives, maintained records of any contributions, cash or otherwise, involved in my 1968 Presidential Campaign. I am sure, however, that various committees supporting my candidacy, along with the Democratic National Party, did maintain records of all

contributions, including cash contributions.

Q If such records were maintained, please state the present location and the name and address of the custodian of those records.

A As previously stated, neither I, nor any of my personal representatives, maintained any records of contributions involving my 1968 Presidential Campaign.

After my nomination in August 1968 at the Democratic National Convention, records of contributions, cash or otherwise, were maintained by the Democratic National Committee and, to the best of my knowledge, are on file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as required by law.

I have read the foregoing pages 3 to 9, inclusive, which contain a correct transcript of the answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.

  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

--000--

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, George Correia, the officer before whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me in stenotypy and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me; that said deposition is a true record of the testimony given by said witness; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

George Correia  
Notary Public in and for the  
District of Columbia

My commission expires:  
June 14, 1978.

--000--

Notary's fee \$ 10.00, charges  
to attorney for affidavit  
Counterclaimant Summa Corp.  
(formerly Hughes Tool Co.)

Airtel

10-31-74

To: SAC, Los Angeles (74-245)

1 - Mr. [redacted] *b7c*

From: Director, FBI (74-2309)

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY  
OO: LA

Reurairtel 10-3-74.

The Criminal Division of the Department has now requested that the FBI obtain copies of that portion of testimony offered in the Maheu vs. Hughes Tool Company case, NO. 72-305HP in United States District Court, Central District of California, relating to the testimony of Maheu's daughter regarding the \$50,000 campaign contribution reportedly given by Maheu to Senator Humphrey during the 1968 Presidential Campaign.

Los Angeles should promptly attempt to obtain copies of transcript of testimony of Maheu's daughter as requested by the Criminal Division.

*b7c*  
[redacted] dmw (4)

EX-101

REC-50 74-2509-3

NOTE: The Department has previously requested investigation of a possible perjury committed by either Senator Humphrey or Robert Maheu, former aide to Howard Hughes. It is an outgrowth of a civil libel suit filed in USDC by Maheu against Hughes. In a counter suit Hughes alleged that Maheu misapplied funds including \$50,000 Maheu reportedly gave Humphrey as a campaign contribution during the 1968 Presidential Campaign. Initial request of the Criminal Division was to obtain copies of testimony by Maheu and by Humphrey in deposition form. On 10-30-74 Department Attorney Edward Lowenberg, General Crimes Section, requested through SA [redacted] that the FBI obtain copies of transcript of testimony of Maheu's daughter in connection with this case.

MAILED 12  
OCT 31 1974  
FBI

Assoc. Dir. \_\_\_\_\_  
Dep. AD Adm. \_\_\_\_\_  
Dep. AD Inv. \_\_\_\_\_  
Asst. Dir.:  
Admin. \_\_\_\_\_ *b7c*  
Comp. Syst. \_\_\_\_\_  
Ext. Affairs \_\_\_\_\_  
Files & Com. \_\_\_\_\_  
Gen. Inv. \_\_\_\_\_  
Ident. \_\_\_\_\_  
Inspection \_\_\_\_\_  
Intell. \_\_\_\_\_  
Laboratory \_\_\_\_\_  
Legal Coun. \_\_\_\_\_  
Plan. & Eval. \_\_\_\_\_  
Spec. Inv. \_\_\_\_\_  
Training \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone Rm. \_\_\_\_\_  
Director Sec'y \_\_\_\_\_

58 NOV 7 1974

MAIL ROOM ☒

TELETYPE UNIT ☐

*Airtel, La*

*10-31-74*

*[redacted] dmw*  
*b7c*

NOV 1 1974

*[redacted]*



FBI

Date: 11/11/74

Transmit the following in \_\_\_\_\_  
(Type in plaintext or code)Via AIRTEL AIR MAIL  
(Priority)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (74-2509)  
FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (74-245)(C)  
SUBJECT: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY  
OO: Los Angeles

Re Bureau airtel to Los Angeles dated 10/31/74.

Enclosed herewith for the Bureau are six (6) copies  
of a Letterhead Memorandum (LHM) reflecting investigation  
conducted by SA [REDACTED] on 11/11/74.

Enclosed for the Washington Field Office is one (1)  
copy of the above described LHM.

Inasmuch as the investigation in the Los Angeles  
Office appears to be complete at this time, the matter is  
being placed in a closed status.

EX-107

REQ 17

74-2509-4

15 NOV 15 1974

- 6-1 pm 2248  
2 - Bureau (Encls. 6)  
2 - Washington Field (Encls. 1)(AM)  
1 - Los Angeles

EX  
[REDACTED] jah  
(5)

Approved: [Signature]  
NOV 25 1974 Special Agent in Charge

Sent \_\_\_\_\_ M Per \_\_\_\_\_



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Los Angeles, California

November 11, 1974

In Reply, Please Refer to  
File No.

SENATOR HUBERT A. HUMPHREY;  
ROBERT A. MAHEU  
PERJURY

On November 11, 1974, Richard W. Johnson, Court Clerk for U. S. District Judge Harry Pregerson, Central District of California, Los Angeles, California, telephone number 688-3433, furnished the following transcript of the testimony furnished by the daughter of Robert A. Maheu, Christine Maheu Jagers, on May 2, 1974:

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

74-2509-4  
ENCLOSURE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HONORABLE HARRY PREGERSON, JUDGE PRESIDING

ROBERT A. MAHEU,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUGHES TOOL COMPANY,  
a corporation, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 72-305-HP

Civil

REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Place: Los Angeles, California

Date: Thursday, May 2, 1974

Pages: 7537 - 7715

*Corrected*  
P. 7570  
P. 7628

- 2 -

SAMUEL GOLDSTEIN, CSR  
JACK ELLIS, CSR  
Official Reporters  
435 U. S. Courthouse  
312 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012  
(213) 622-1678

## 1 APPEARANCES.

2 For the Plaintiff and  
3 Counterdefendant:

GALANE, TINGEY & SHEARING  
By: MORTON R. GALANE  
DON TINGEY  
MIRIAM SHEARING  
1100 First National Bank Building  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

and

6 HURLEY & GRASSINI  
7 By: LAWRENCE P. GRASSINI  
8 11313 Weddington Street  
9 North Hollywood, California 91601

10 For the Defendant and  
11 Counterclaimant:

HUGHES, HUBBARD & REED  
By: NORBERT A. SCHLEI  
JOHN BLUE  
515 South Flower Street  
Suite 2908  
Los Angeles, California 90071

and

14 DAVIS & COX  
15 By: ANDREW WILLING  
16 HOWARD JAFFE  
17 1900 Avenue of the Stars  
18 Suite 1450  
19 Los Angeles, California 90067

# I N D E X

<u>PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES:</u>	<u>DIRECT</u>	<u>CROSS</u>	<u>REDIRECT</u>	<u>RECROSS</u>
GAY, Frank William (By Deposition)	7542			
BELL, Thomas G. (By Deposition)	7576			
JAGGERS, Christine Maheu				
By Mr. Galane	7697			
By Mr. Schlei		7699		
By Mr. Galane			7704	
By Mr. Schlei				7706
By Mr. Galane			7709	
By Mr. Schlei				7711
By Mr. Galane			7713	

380



1 THE COURT: Mr. Galane, I understand Mr. Maheu's  
2 daughter is here. Do you want to call her?

3 MR. GALANE: Is she here?

4 MR. MAHEU: Yes.

5 MR. GALANE: I didn't know that. Well, no one  
6 interrupted me.

7 I'll remember where I left off. It was very  
8 short, Your Honor.

9 MR. SCHLEI: Your Honor, once again, we were  
10 apprised of Miss Maheu's use as a witness at 4 o'clock  
11 yesterday afternoon, which is -- I guess what happened is that  
12 at 4 o'clock yesterday we were asked if it would be okay for  
13 her to go on today if she should happen to be here, and we  
14 said in view of the fact that we had not received from  
15 the reporter a copy of her deposition that we would prefer  
16 to wait until the 48-hour period for that.

17 THE COURT: Well, we'll put her on. If you have  
18 any problem have her come back tomorrow.

19 MR. SCHLEI: We would like to be apprised of  
20 the names of the witnesses in accordance with the rules that  
21 we had to follow.

22 THE COURT: Yes.

23 - 5 -

24 CHRISTINE MAHEU JAGGERS,  
25 called as a witness for and on behalf of the plaintiff, having

K2-2

1 been first sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

2 THE CLERK: Please be seated.

3 Please state your full name and spell the last.

4 THE WITNESS: Christine Maheu Jagers.

5 J-a-g-g-e-r-s.

7 DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. GALANE:

9 Q Mrs. Jagers, what is your present home address?

10 A 2201 Geronimo.

11 Q Is that in Las Vegas, Nevada?

12 A Yes, it is.

13 Q You are the daughter of Mr. Robert A. Maheu?

14 A Yes, I am.

15 Q Directing your testimony to the day after  
16 Election Day of the year 1968, can you state to His Honor and  
17 to the members of the jury everything that you remember that  
18 occurred?

19 A I can't say it was the exact day after the  
20 election. I don't remember exactly. It was after the  
21 election sometime, and I'm not going to say a date because  
22 I don't remember the exact date. But I remember it just being  
23 after the election. - 6 -

24 And you want me to tell about --

25 Q What occurred and what you heard.

1 A C 1, the telephone rang. A I think it was  
2 early in the morning, I can't remember. My dad was sleeping.  
3 Whenever he used to get to sleep I wouldn't wake him unless  
4 it was really important because he only used to sleep, maybe,  
5 three or four hours at night when he -- if he got that he  
6 was lucky to get that.

7 So, anyway, I answered the telephone and a voice  
8 said, "Hello. Is Mr. Maheu there?" Well, I answered the  
9 phone saying, "Maheu residence." Then the voice said, "Hello.  
10 Is Mr. Maheu there?"

11 Then I said, "Who is calling, please?" And the  
12 voice said "Vice President. Vice President calling."

13 So then I went and I woke up my father and I told  
14 him the Vice President was on the phone. And I left the phone  
15 in my room off the hook and I went and I woke up my dad. And  
16 I didn't wait to see, you know, whether he picked up the phone  
17 or not, I just went back to my room and I picked up the receiver  
18 and listened 'cause I was -- 'cause -- excited that the Vice  
19 President would be calling my father.

20 Do you want me to explain what I heard in the  
21 conversation?

22 Q That was the pending question, Mrs. Jagers. Please.

23 A Then the voice -- Vice President said, "I want to  
24 thank" -- this is what I heard. I just heard him say, "I want  
25 to thank you -- thank Mr. Hughes for the hundred thousand" and

-4

1 "that I'll continue to be of assistance, and "underground  
2 nuclear testing." And I didn't know what he meant by that  
3 testing, or anything, but now I do.

4 Q How old were you then?

5 A I was 15.

6 MR. GALANE: That's the end of the examination.

7 THE COURT: Mr. Schlei.

8

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. SCHLEI:

11 Q Miss Maheu --

12 A Mrs. Jagers.

13 Q -- you say it was early in the morning when this --  
14 I mean, Mrs. Jagers. I am sorry. You say it was early in  
15 the morning or was this during the day?

16 A I can't be sure. I don't remember. I think it  
17 was in the morning, but I am not sure.

18 Q Was it a weekday?

19 A I don't remember the date.

20 Q Was it during school hours?

21 A I don't remember the time. It could have been,  
22 you know, 6:00 in the morning.

23 Q Prior to the time that you told anybody about  
24 this conversation had you read in the newspapers that there  
25 was a dispute in which your father was involved as to whether

2-5

1 he had received a certain political contribution or whether  
2 he made a certain political contribution?

3 A What do you mean before? You mean --

4 Q Before you told anybody about hearing this  
5 conversation.

6 A Just one day when I picked up the newspaper and  
7 I read something and then I went and I told my dad about  
8 the conversation. But until then I didn't. But --

9 Q All right. Did you in those days when you were  
10 15 play hooky a lot from school?

11 A Yes, I did, very often, yes.

12 Q And it was possible you were supposed to be  
13 in school at the time of this call; is that possible?

14 A Right.

15 Q When you didn't go to school did you tell people  
16 that you were sick?

17 A Sometimes. Or I'd just make excuses, to say  
18 something like, oh, "They're having an assembly today,"  
19 or "I don't have to go," or just say -- I had lots of excuses.  
20 I didn't like school.

21 MR. SCHLEI: I have nothing further, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: When was it that you first told your  
23 dad that you listened in on that conversation?

24 THE WITNESS: It was about two months ago. I  
25 can't say the exact date. But it was when I read something



2-6

1 in my evening paper that Humphrey dei 10 or something,  
2 50,000. And I thought, well, "It might have had something  
3 to do with it, that conversation I listened when I listened  
4 in on."

5 So I went over to his house and I told him --  
6 or his aide denied it, or something like that. That's the  
7 first time I ever mentioned it to my dad.

8 THE COURT: This is two months ago?

9 THE WITNESS: I think it was about two months  
10 ago.

11 THE COURT: Was that the first time you had  
12 ever heard the voice of the person you believed was the  
13 Vice President on the telephone?

14 THE WITNESS: No. Well, I recognized the voice  
15 as that of being the Vice President. I knew it was because  
16 I know his accent. I mean, I heard him on television and --

17 THE COURT: Did you tell any of your friends  
18 that you listened in on a conversation between your father  
19 and the Vice President?

20 THE WITNESS: I never told anybody 'cause I knew  
21 a lot of things and I didn't tell anybody at school things  
22 that I knew about.

23 THE COURT: How much of the conversation did  
24 you hear?

25 THE WITNESS: I'd say the conversation might

1-7

1 have lasted, maybe, five minutes. But I only remember --  
2 I heard it all 'cause I didn't hang up till he hung up,  
3 my dad hung up. But that's all I remember, because the  
4 figure, a hundred thousand, it just stuck with me over  
5 the years. I just couldn't believe a hundred thousand.

6 THE COURT: Well, you heard the conversation  
7 from the start to the end between your dad and the person  
8 who called; is that right?

9 A Yes. He called my dad "Bob," and didn't say  
10 Mr. Maheu. He called him "Bob."

11 THE COURT: What else did they talk about?

12 THE WITNESS: I don't remember. I just remember  
13 the figure, you know, a hundred thousand. It just stuck  
14 with me. And then something about the underground testing,  
15 because -- and at the time I really didn't know what it is  
16 but later on in the years I knew Hughes wanted underground  
17 testing stopped in Nevada so I figured that was what it was  
18 about.

19 THE COURT: Well, what did your dad say?

20 THE WITNESS: He didn't know I listened in on  
21 the conversation.

22 THE COURT: Well, what did your dad say to the  
23 other party?

24 THE WITNESS: He just said -- I can't remember.  
25 I just remember the Vice President thanking my dad for a

297

1 hundred thousand and that he'll be -- still be of assistance  
2 in any way he can or -- in the testing -- underground testing.

3 THE COURT: Do you remember what your dad said  
4 in response to that statement?

5 THE WITNESS: I -- I can't remember.

6 THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Schlei.

7 MR. SCHLEI: Can I ask a couple more questions,  
8 Your Honor?

9 THE COURT: Yes.

10

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed)

12 BY MR. SCHLEI:

13 Q Mrs. Jagers, when your father took the phone  
14 you said you then went back to your own room and picked it  
15 up. How long would that have taken?

16 A Fifteen seconds, maybe; not very long.

17 Q At any rate, they had been talking for some  
18 period of time before you got back to the phone; is that  
19 correct?

20 A Not very long because I hurried.

21 Q Well, if I told you that you testified to a half  
22 a minute, 30 seconds in your deposition, would that refresh  
23 your recollection?

24 A Well, 30 seconds, 15 seconds -- I mean, I just  
25 went from my father's room to my room as fast as I could go;

1 however long that would take, I don't know.

2 Q Was there a different person who placed the  
3 call? When you initially answered the phone was that  
4 somebody other than the Vice President?

5 A I don't know. All I know is the voice said,  
6 "The Vice President calling," and I don't know if when he  
7 said that -- the voice said that I couldn't say that was --  
8 I didn't recognize the voice as being that of Vice President --  
9 as the Vice President 'cause he didn't talk long enough to,  
10 you know, hear an accent or something.

11 Q So you just don't know who it was you initially  
12 heard?

13 A Right. Well, I know now because you did tell me  
14 in my -- when I had my deposition, you told me who -- that  
15 it was another voice, so --

16 Q What I told you was what your father said.

17 A Right. Right.

18 Q But I may also have told you that he says he  
19 didn't make the call.

20 I have nothing further, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Galane.

22

23

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

24

BY MR. GALANE:

25

Q Mrs. Jagers, why didn't you tell your father prior



K10

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

to the time that you testified to coming over hearing this conversation?

A Because my dad wouldn't have approved of it at all. I mean, just listening in on people's conversations.

And when we were young, I mean, he wouldn't even let me go to a movie when I was 13 and passed -- I could pass for 12 and get in for 50 cents, he would make me pay the full amount. I'd tell them a lie to get in for 12 and I'd still -- he'd say "No, you're not. You pay the full amount. You're 13 now. You're not 12 anymore." And he wouldn't have approved at all.

Q Well, why would you violate your dad's instructions?

A Curiosity.

Q Had you ever done it on other occasions?

A Listened in on the phone conversations?

Q Yes.

A Yes; but it was only -- I never would like with -- it was just with my father or Mr. Hughes, or something, it wasn't like my father or my brother, or anything like that. It was just when I was young, you know, it was just Hughes' voice, and everything, I always wanted to hear it, that's all.

Q Assuming that Mr. Robert Maheu has testified that the voice that initially called on that occasion before the Vice President took the phone was the voice of the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, namely, Mr. Lawrence

1 O'Brien, did you know that voice?

2 A No, I didn't.

3 Q Are you saying, then, in effect you do not know  
4 and cannot testify to who was the first voice?

5 A Right.

6 Q Now, then, you picked up the phone again. On  
7 what basis can you testify it was the voice of the Vice  
8 President?

9 A Well, the voice said, "The Vice President calling,"  
10 and then I recognized -- I mean, to me Humphrey has a  
11 distinctive voice.

12 Q Senator Humphrey, Mrs. Jagers. Please.

13 A He has a distinctive voice. And I think he has  
14 got a strong accent and I recognized it.

15 Q How long were you able to hear Senator Humphrey's  
16 voice, would you estimate, when you came back into your room?

17 A Well, just -- I just heard what he said. Well,  
18 I heard the conversation, but I don't remember the rest of it.  
19 Maybe five minutes. But it -- it was not just his voice, my  
20 dad was speaking, too.

21  
22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. SCHLEI:

24 Q Mrs. Jagers, when you read in the newspaper  
25 story about this question, the newspaper story said something

K12

1 about \$50,000, didn't it?

2 A I think that's right, yes.

3 Q Well, how did you know that the fifty thousand  
4 had any relationship to the hundred-thousand-dollar remark  
5 that --

6 A Well, I didn't, but I -- I didn't, but I mean  
7 I just figured it -- you know, it might have, it might be of  
8 some importance.

9 Q Now, Mrs. Jagers, in the taking of your deposition  
10 did you say that you could not be positively sure it was a  
11 hundred thousand?

12 A I don't remember. I am -- I am almost sure it  
13 was a hundred thousand 'cause the figure stuck with me.

14 Q Well, let me read what you said. The question  
15 is at page 30, line 27:

16 "Q How did you know that that \$100,000  
17 had any relationship whatsoever to the \$50,000  
18 which you have testified the newspaper said  
19 Humphrey denied receiving?

20 "A I said about the hundred thousand  
21 in the beginning, I said I think it was a hundred  
22 thousand. I cannot be positively sure it was a  
23 hundred thousand. But then -- and the question  
24 is what? How does -- what is your question?"

25 Do you remember that?

392

K13

1

A Uh-huh.

2

Q Is that the truth?

3

A No. I remember the figure a hundred thousand.

4

I was nervous in my deposition. I mean, the questions were

5

coming so fast at me, one after the other.

end K

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 Q So that while you said this, it wasn't true?

2 A Well, no. I mean I didn't deliberately -- no -- I  
3 remember a figure of one hundred thousand, but I don't like to  
4 say -- I don't know why I said that in my deposition.

5 MR. SCHLEI: That's all.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Galane.

7 MR. GALANE: With your Honor's permission may I  
8 allow Mrs. Jagers to see what she did say in the deposition?

9 THE COURT: All right.

10 X FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. GALANE:

12 Q Mrs. Jagers, when Mr. Schlei read to you your  
13 statement "what is your question" and then the lawyer said,  
14 "Mr. Reporter, will you read back the question, please?" and  
15 it says, "Record read" -- read to the jurors what answer you  
16 gave in full to that question.

17 A "Well, because in the article, in the newspaper,  
18 it says -- it tells about when he was supposed to have re-  
19 ceived the contribution, and such. And that that was the  
20 same time, about, that I had overheard that conversation."

21 Q Now, go back to the question and clear up to the  
22 jurors, if you would, what was in the newspaper and what it is  
23 you were talking about with reference to the phone conversation?  
24 You can turn to the preceding page and see what they asked you.

25 A Do you want me to read the question?

1 Q Yes.

2 A "How did you know that that \$100,000 had any  
3 relationship whatsoever to the \$50,000 which you have testi-  
4 fied the newspaper said Humphrey denied receiving?

5 "A I said that the hundred thousand in the  
6 beginning, I said I think it was a hundred thousand. I  
7 cannot be positively sure it was a hundred thousand. But  
8 then -- and the question is what? How does -- what is your  
9 question?"

10 Q Read the whole answer so it is clear what you  
11 answered.

12 A Then "Mr. Reporter, would you please read back" --

13 "Well, because in the article, in the newspaper,  
14 it says -- it tells about when he was supposed to have re-  
15 ceived the contribution, and such. And that that was the  
16 same time, about, that I had overheard that conversation."

17 Q All right. Now, what sum of money did the newspaper  
18 talk about that you read? That was the Las Vegas Review  
19 Journal you were getting?

20 A Right.

21 Q What sum of money did you read there, Mrs. Jagers?

22 A Fifty thousand.

23 Q What sum of money is it you are saying you remember  
24 in the phone conversation? -19-

25 A A hundred thousand.

505

MR. GALANE: That's it.

FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

EX BY MR. SCHLEI:

Q You did say, Mrs. Jagers, that the contribution that you read about was about the same time as the conversation that you heard?

A Would you say that again, please?

Q Was it your testimony that the contribution you read about was about the same time as the conversation that you overheard?

A Correct, correct.

MR. SCHLEI: I have nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: You say the phone rang and you picked up the phone and the voice said, "The Vice-President is calling," and you went to wake up your dad?

THE WITNESS: I said "Maheu residence."

THE COURT: Then you went to wake up your dad, and it took you about thirty seconds to get back to the phone?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: How long was it after you picked up the phone that you heard this particular conversation about money?

THE WITNESS: Maybe a minute later. I guess right away. I'm not sure.

THE COURT: The conversation itself lasted about five minutes?

1 THE WITNESS: I'd say, or even less. To me it didn't  
2 seem -- it didn't last very long.

3 THE COURT: You are not sure whether it lasted five  
4 minutes, or how long it lasted?

5 THE WITNESS: Right. I can't be sure, but it seemed  
6 to be a short conversation.

7 THE COURT: What was the first thing you heard when  
8 you picked up the phone after you awakened your dad?

9 THE WITNESS: When I went back and picked up the  
10 phone?

11 THE COURT: When you went back and picked up the  
12 phone.

13 THE WITNESS: I just -- I heard the Vice-President  
14 say, "Bob, would you thank Mr. Hughes for the hundred thousand,  
15 and I will be of assistance to him in any way that I can, and  
16 continue to be of assistance to him."

17 THE COURT: What did your dad say?

18 THE WITNESS: I don't remember what he said.

19 THE COURT: Was anything said about the election  
20 having been lost?

21 THE WITNESS: I don't remember.

22 THE COURT: Do you remember what was said when the  
23 conversation ended?

24 THE WITNESS: No, I can't.

25 THE COURT: All right. - 21 -

39

1 Anything else, Mr. Galane?

2 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. GALANE:

4 Q When Mr. Schlei asked you whether the contribution  
5 was the same time as the phone call, do you realize that is  
6 the way he worded it? Do you know what you answered?

7 A I see my mistake now. The contribution was the same  
8 time?

9 Q That's how he worded his question. What is it you  
10 are testifying to, Mrs. Jagers? Do you know when the contri-  
11 bution was made?

12 A No, I don't. Just approximately, from what I have  
13 read in the papers, now I know.

14 Q Do you know if the contribution was made at the time  
15 of the phone call?

16 A No, I don't.

17 Q Do you know if the contribution was made before the  
18 phone call?

19 A No, I don't.

20 Q Do you know when any particular portion of the  
21 contribution was made?

22 A No, I don't.

23 Q Did you intend, when you gave your testimony here  
24 today, to try to relate the date of the conversation to the  
25 date of the contribution? -22-



1 A No. But --

2 Q Do you realize that is how his question sounded?

3 A No, I didn't.

4 MR. GALANE: That's all.

5 THE WITNESS: I am sorry, I didn't understand.

6 THE COURT: Anything else?

7 MR. SCHLEI: No, sir.

8 THE COURT: Fine. Thank you very much, Mrs. Jagers.  
9 How much do you have on Holliday?

10 MR. GALANE: Very little, your Honor.

11 THE COURT: What does that mean in terms of time?

12 MR. GALANE: A few minutes. I am just getting into  
13 the termination.

14 THE COURT: I have a 1:30 doctor's appointment.

15 MR. GALANE: I am vetoed by my colleagues.

16 THE COURT: How long do you think you will take?

17 MR. GALANE: I have been wrong before, your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Do you think you can finish it in five  
19 minutes? The doctor's office is just a few blocks from here.

20 MR. GALANE: I will try, sir.

21 Your Honor, can't we hold off until tomorrow? Mr.  
22 Tingey is, frankly, concerned that I will irritate everybody.  
23 I would prefer that, sir.

24 THE COURT: All right. It has been a hard day,  
25 anyway.

1 All right, ladies and gentlemen, we will recess  
2 until a quarter after eight tomorrow morning.

3 If you will rise the bailiff will show you to  
4 the jury room.

5 (Whereupon, at 1:15 p.m. an adjournment was taken  
6 to reconvene at 8:15 a.m. Friday, May 3, 1974.)  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Humphrey, Hubert H.

139-3741

**40 PGS. AVAIL.**

F B I

Date: November 10, 1970

Transmit the following in PLAIN  
(Type in plaintext or code)Via AIRTEL  
(Priority)

To: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, MINNEAPOLIS (139-83)

UNSUB; INTERCEPTION OF RADIO TELEPHONE  
TRANSMISSION OF HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
SEPTEMBER 26, 1970, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA  
INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS

25

Re MR call to the Bureau regarding captioned matter  
on this date.

USA ROBERT RENNER, Minnesota Division, advised today that he intends to contact the Department of Justice in Washington, and suggest that an investigation be instituted in this matter. He stated that he realized that in all probability the circumstances were not such as to constitute a violation of law, and that the interception of the communication was, in all probability, accidental rather than wilful. However, he added that he understood that Congressman CLARK MacGREGOR was being considered for nomination to the vacancy currently existing on the 8th Circuit. In view of this, he felt that it was quite possible that this incident would again come to light during the course of the investigation, in connection with this appointment, and that it would be to the best interest of all concerned to at least have basic facts available.

5

This is being furnished to acquaint the Bureau with current developments.

2 - Bureau  
1 - Minneapolis  
RGH:RSK  
(3)

MCT-32 2-86

EX-112

NOV 12 1970

SIX

59 NOV 18 1970

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Special Agent in Charge

Sent \_\_\_\_\_ M Per \_\_\_\_\_

402

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

NOV 16 1970

TELETYPE

Mr. Sullivan	
Mr. Mohr	
Mr. Bishop	
Mr. Casper	
Mr. Conrad	
Mr. Felt	
Mr. Gale	
Mr. Rosen	
Mr. Tavel	
Mr. Walters	
Tele. Room	
Mr. Holmes	
Miss Gandy	

NR 007 MP PLAIN

314PM URGENT 11-16-70 MAW

TO DIRECTOR

FROM MINNEAPOLIS (139-83) 1P

Unknown Subject

UNSUB; INTERCEPTION OF RADIO TELEPHONE TRANSMISSION OF HUBERT  
H. HUMPHREY, SEPTEMBER TWENTYSIX, LAST, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA,  
INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS.

Reference Minneapolis

United States Attorney

~~REXXX~~ AIRTEL NOVEMBER TEN LAST REGARDING USA ROBERT RENNERS  
INTENTION TO SUGGEST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ~~THAT AN~~  
INVESTIGATION BE INSTITUTED IN THIS MATTER.

USA RENNER TELEPHONICALLY CONTACTED THIS OFFICE TODAY TO  
ADVISE THAT HE HAD DISCUSSED THIS CASE  
WITH DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST WHO  
INSTRUCTED THAT IN VIEW OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES, RENNER SHOULD REQUEST THE  
DO  
FBI ~~DOX~~ SUCH INVESTIGATION AS HE FELT NECESSARY.

ACCORDINGLY INQUIRY WILL BE INITIATED IMMEDIATELY.

END

DEB QWA DC FBI CLR

23 DEC 1 1970

MR. SULLIVAN FOR THE DIRECTOR

403

2



11/17/70

GENERAL INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

Attached relates to a complaint received by U. S. Attorney (USA), Minneapolis, concerning alleged interception of communications violation in which an unidentified "ham" radio operator happened to intercept a radio telephone conversation between Hubert Humphrey and two of his aides on 9/26/70. The "ham" operator relayed this conversation to Congressman Clark McGregor (R-Minnesota) who was opposing Humphrey in the U. S. Senate race in Minnesota at that time. U. S. Attorney advised only logical investigation would be to identify and interview the "ham" radio operator, but did not desire investigation be conducted while the Senate campaign was in progress as he felt investigation would become a political issue. The attached advises that U. S. Attorney, with concurrence of Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst now requests we interview the "ham" radio operator in order that an evaluation may be made by the U. S. Attorney as to whether a valid interception of communications violation is indicated. It is noted Congressman McGregor is reportedly under consideration for appointment as a\*judge in Minnesota. Results of investigation will be promptly submitted to the U. S. Attorney and the Department.

CAN:mlp

✓ \*Federal

404

3

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

REPORTING OFFICE MINNEAPOLIS	OFFICE OF ORIGIN MINNEAPOLIS	DATE 11/24/70	INVESTIGATIVE PERIOD 11/16-24/70
TITLE OF CASE  CHANGED: UNKNOWN SUBJECT; Interception of Radio Telephone Transmission of HUBERT H HUMPHREY, 9/27/70, Minneapolis, Minnesota		REPORT MADE BY SA [REDACTED] <i>ATC</i>	TYPED BY jwh
		CHARACTER OF CASE  INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS  <i>LVF</i>	

The title has been changed to set out the date of intercept phone call as 9/27/70, established through investigation.

REFERENCES:

Minneapolis teletype to the Bureau dated 11/16/70.

- P -

ENCLOSURESTO BUREAU

Two cassette tapes containing a dubbing of a statement

ACCOMPLISHMENTS CLAIMED						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE	ACQUIT- TALS	CASE HAS BEEN:  PENDING OVER ONE YEAR <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO PENDING PROSECUTION OVER SIX MONTHS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
CONVIC.	AUTO.	FUG.	FINES	SAVINGS	RECOVERIES			
APPROVED <i>H. P. [Signature]</i>							DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW	
COPIES MADE:							139-3741-2	
2 - Bureau (Enc. - 2) ENCLOSURE							REC-52	
1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota							NOV 30 1970 EX-175	
3 - Minneapolis (139-83)								
Dissemination Record of Attached Report							Notations	
Agency	1 - R. A. D. [Signature]						STAT. SECT.	
Request Recd.	O. G. [Signature]							
Date Fwd.	ATTN: MR. JAMES R. [Signature]							
How Fwd.	ROBINSON							
By	CAN map							

COVER PAGE

EXP. PROC.

MP 139-83

by CLARK MAC GREGOR, which was aired on WCCO Radio newscast  
10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m., 9/27/70.

LEADS:

MINNEAPOLIS

AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Will continue efforts to locate CHARLES SLOCUM,  
former campaign aide to CLARK MAC GREGOR relative to determining  
identity of individual intercepting HUBERT H. HUMPHREY radio  
telephone call 9/27/70.

- B\* -  
COVER PAGE

406

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to: 1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Report of: [REDACTED] b7c  
Date: November 24, 1970

Office: Minneapolis, Minnesota

Field Office File #: 139-83

Bureau File #:

Title: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
September 27, 1970,  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ Minneapolis, Minnesota

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Character: INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS

Synopsis: During 1970 Minnesota U. S. Senatorial Campaign, Candidate CLARK MAC GREGOR delivered political speech 9/26/70 critical of opponent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. HUMPHREY aide reports in contact with HUMPHREY 1 a.m., 9/27/70, via radio telephone regarding possible response to MAC GREGOR's criticism, response to be made by DAVID GRAVEN. GRAVEN response aired on WCCO Radio 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. news, 9/27/70, Minneapolis, Minnesota. During newscast, MAC GREGOR called WCCO with statement, which was also aired during 9/27/70 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. newscast in which MAC GREGOR states friend intercepted phone call from HUMPHREY to GRAVEN, dictating what GRAVEN would say. Tape recording MAC GREGOR statement obtained. MAC GREGOR Campaign Aide advised message referred to by MAC GREGOR was radio phone conversation of HUMPHREY intercepted by automobile mechanic, Bloomington, Minnesota, results of which were mentioned by automobile mechanic to MAC GREGOR or one of his aides at political rally 9/27/70. Investigation to identify automobile mechanic intercepting phone call continuing.

- P -

MP 139-83

DETAILS:

AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

This investigation is predicated upon the request of United States Attorney ROBERT G. RENNER, Minneapolis, Minnesota, on November 16, 1970. Mr. RENNER made available a copy of a letter from MARTIN S. FOX, TODD DAVISON, and NORMAN TORRISON. Mr. RENNER also made available an article by TED SMEBAKKEN, appearing in the September 29, 1970, issue of "The Minneapolis Star," a daily newspaper of general circulation, published in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

The above items furnished by Mr. RENNER are attached:



October 1, 1970

The Honorable Douglas Head  
Attorney General  
State of Minnesota

Re: 1934 Federal Communications Act, Section 605  
Public Disclosure of U.S. House Representative  
Mr. Clark McGregor, admitting reception of  
protected communications

Dear Sir:


The media reports appear to confirm beyond doubt that Representative McGregor has violated the above-captioned federal act. The act provides for a \$10,000 fine and/or one year in prison, according to the reports we have seen.


We are anxious to learn whether there has been an actual violation. If so, we are determined to see that law and order will be applied in our Society wherever appropriate. In this case, eavesdropping has been used by a public official of high station, who espouses "law and order", for the basest of purposes.


While we feel that any reasonable American should be affronted by this morally reprehensible conduct, only the full and fair application of societal sanctions can judge such behavior. Such judgement is initiated either in the voting booth, or, if his conduct is also criminal by the speedy and unequivocal application of our laws.

We anxiously await your reply in that, certainly, it will be impossible for us to let this matter rest without satisfying ourselves that we have done our duty here. If action should be taken, it should be taken now.

Very truly yours

  
Martin S. Fox  
2134 Pinehurst Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55116

  
Todd Davison  
3232 18th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407

  
Norman Torrison  
12910 27th Avenue North  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55427

cc: WCCO News  
Minneapolis Star and Tribune  
George C. Scott - Hennepin County Attorney  
Hubert H. Humphrey Campaign Headquarters  
Clark McGregor Campaign Headquarters  
United States Attorney



# THE MINNEAPOLIS

Tuesday, Sept. 29, 1970

XCII—No. 264

Four Sections

\*

## Intercept of Humphrey's Call? Alleged

By TED STEBAKIN  
Minneapolis Star Staff Writer

The case of the intercepted telephone message took over today as "the issue" of the moment in the Humphrey-MacGregor campaign for the U.S. Senate.

The fuss started with a ham radio operator in Bloomington and, according to Republican Rep. Clark MacGregor, has definite political ramifications.

According to aides of former Vice-President Hubert Humphrey, it has definite legal ramifications, particularly as it relates to criminal provisions of the 1934 Federal Communications Act.

The train of events as reconstructed by aides of both candidates, is as follows:

MacGregor delivered a hard-hitting attack against Humphrey Sunday afternoon, accusing the DFL rival of being a "yes man" for Lyndon Johnson who couldn't say "no." If Humphrey were a girl, MacGregor said, he would be "pregnant" all of the time.

Humphrey, taken aback, by MacGregor's speech, called aides Norman Sherman and D. J.

Leary by mobile telephone late Saturday afternoon to discuss the turn of events.

A ham radio operator in Bloomington, whom MacGregor aides refuse to identify, happened to listen in on the ensuing conversation.

On Sunday, the ham advised MacGregor what he had heard, namely that Humphrey issued orders that MacGregor's remarks be publicly rebutted.

They were within hours. David Graven, unsuccessful DFL candidate for governor, taped a radio message Sunday morning accusing MacGregor of resorting to "borderline obscenities." The taped message was put out over Twin Cities area radio and television stations and distributed by Humphrey's office to radio stations outside the area.

MacGregor responded Sunday night, declaring that a supporter had intercepted "a telephone call from Hubert Humphrey to David Graven dictating what David Graven would say."

Today, MacGregor returned to the attack. Humphrey, he said, was guilty of "scolding two boys" to do his "dirty work." (The second "boy" was state DFL chairman Richard Moe, who also issued a statement critical of the congressman.)

MacGregor said Humphrey lacks the courage to respond directly, thus had Graven cut the television tapes.

Leary said there "absolutely" was no Humphrey-to-Graven call, that the monitored conversation, if any, was that between Humphrey and his aides. Leary said the Graven statement about MacGregor was initiated by Graven.

Leary said the possibility of criminal violation of federal law is being investigated.

According to Donald Murray, regional engineer for the Federal Communications Commission, the possibility of any future federal law violations in the matter must be considered.

Murray said Section 225 of the Communications Act prohibits anyone from divulging or publishing the contents of any intercepted radio message. The law also applies to the recipient of an intercepted radio message.

Violation of the law is classified as a misdemeanor, punishable by a \$10,000 fine or one year in prison or both.

1

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date November 23, 1970

Mr. MARTIN S. FOX, 2134 Pinehurst Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota, was interviewed at the North American Life and Casualty Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Mr. FOX advised as follows:

Mr. FOX and his associates, TODD DAVISON and NORMAN TORRISON, directed a letter to the Attorney General for the state of Minnesota, with copies to various other individuals, setting out their concern regarding a possible violation of the 1934 Federal Communications Act, Section 605, following news reports that CLARK MAC GREGOR, a 1970 candidate for the United States Senate from Minnesota, made statements that he, MAC GREGOR, had been furnished the results of an intercepted telephone call made by his opponent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to HUMPHREY's campaign aides.

Mr. FOX noted that, according to newspaper accounts, the telephone call by Mr. HUMPHREY had been intercepted by a ham radio operator, who, in turn, furnished the content of Mr. HUMPHREY's telephone call to CLARK MAC GREGOR, after which Mr. MAC GREGOR made reference to the content of this telephone call during a campaign statement.

Mr. FOX advised he had no direct knowledge of either the interception of the telephone call, nor had he heard Mr. MAC GREGOR's comment concerning the content of the phone call. He stated the purpose of his letter to the Attorney General of the state of Minnesota was to evidence his personal concern over an apparent violation of the law, and to call for appropriate investigation by responsible agencies.

- 5 -

On 11/18/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83

by SAs [redacted] JTC Date dictated 11/23/70

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

411



1

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date November 23, 1970

Mr. NORMAN TORRISON, 12910 Twenty-seventh Avenue North, Minneapolis, Minnesota, was interviewed at the North American Life and Casualty Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and advised as follows:

Mr. TORRISON and his associates, MARTIN S. FOX and TODD DAVISON, directed a letter to the Attorney General for the state of Minnesota, with copies to various other individuals, setting out their concern regarding a possible violation of the 1934 Federal Communications Act, Section 605, following news reports that CLARK MAC GREGOR, 1970 candidate for the United States Senate from the state of Minnesota, made statements that he, MAC GREGOR, had been furnished the results of an intercepted telephone call made by his opponent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to HUMPHREY's campaign aides.

Mr. TORRISON noted that, according to newspaper accounts, the telephone call by Mr. HUMPHREY had been intercepted by a ham radio operator, who, in turn, furnished the content of Mr. HUMPHREY's telephone call to CLARK MAC GREGOR, after which Mr. MAC GREGOR made reference to the content of this telephone call during a campaign statement.

Mr. TORRISON advised he had no direct knowledge of either the interception of the telephone call, nor had he heard Mr. MAC GREGOR's comment concerning the content of the phone call. He stated the purpose of his letter to the Attorney General for the state of Minnesota was to evidence his personal concern over an apparent violation of the law, and to call for appropriate investigation by responsible agencies.

- 6 -

On 11/18/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83

by SAs [redacted] b7c Date dictated 11/23/70

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

412

11

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date November 23, 1970

Mr. TODD DAVISON, 3232 Eighteenth Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota, was interviewed at the North American Life and Casualty Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and advised as follows:

Mr. DAVISON, along with business associates, MARTIN S. FOX and NORMAN TORRISON, directed a letter to the Attorney General for the state of Minnesota, with copies to various officials, on October 1, 1970, after newspaper reports to the effect that CLARK MAC GREGOR, candidate for the United States Senate from the state of Minnesota, during the 1970 election, had stated during a campaign appearance that a ham radio operator in Bloomington, Minnesota, had intercepted a telephone call from Mr. MAC GREGOR's opponent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to Mr. HUMPHREY's campaign aides, and Mr. MAC GREGOR used the contents of this intercepted telephone message during a campaign statement.

Mr. DAVISON stated that he made several telephone calls, including calls to Mr. HUMPHREY's Assistant, D. J. LEARY, and "Minneapolis Star" Staff Writer, TED SMEBAKKEN, to confirm, to his satisfaction, that Mr. HUMPHREY had, in fact, made a telephone conversation and, further, that Mr. MAC GREGOR had made reference to a HUMPHREY telephone conversation during a campaign statement.

Mr. DAVISON stated that it appeared that a strong prima-facie case existed, showing that Mr. MAC GREGOR had, in fact, violated the 1934 Federal Communications Act, Section 605, and, while, he, DAVISON, did not care to see this intercepted phone call made a political issue, he was concerned that in this day where law and order receive such emphasis by candidates, including CLARK MAC GREGOR, that this apparent law violation by MAC GREGOR be subject to investigation and possible prosecution to insure that all people understand that the system of criminal justice applies impartially and equally.

Mr. DAVISON advised that neither he nor his  
~~two associates are or have been involved in the political~~

- 7 -

On 11/18/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83

by SAs [REDACTED] b7c Date dictated 11/23/70

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

413



MP 139-83

2

campaign of either Mr. MAC GREGOR or Mr. HUMPHREY, nor have they been active in any political party.

Mr. DAVISON advised that he has no direct knowledge concerning the statement by Mr. MAC GREGOR concerning the intercepted telephone message or direct knowledge concerning the interception in question.

Mr. DAVISON stated that it is his intention, as a recently appointed member of the Minnesota State Bar, to follow this matter in whatever way he can to insure, to his own satisfaction that this matter is handled with the full and fair application of the law.

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date November 23, 1970

DENNIS JOHN LEARY, 5201 Abbott Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota, was interviewed at the HUBERT H. HUMPHREY Campaign Headquarters, Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and advised as follows:

He is President of Media Communication Consultants, Incorporated, operating from 5201 Abbott Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and is currently the assistant to HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in charge of media relations, and so served during the recent Minnesota United States Senatorial Campaign in which HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was elected Senator from the state of Minnesota.

On September 26, 1970, Minneapolis newspapers carried an account of a statement by Mr. HUMPHREY's opponent, CLARK S. MAC GREGOR, to the effect that Mr. HUMPHREY was a "yes man," and if HUMPHREY were a woman, he would have been pregnant all the time. Following the appearance of this article, Mr. HUMPHREY called his Campaign Headquarters from a mobile phone, and spoke with Mr. LEARY and campaign aide, NORMAN SHERMAN, in a three-way conversation, during which Mr. HUMPHREY asked whether or not they had seen the news article, and the aides informed Mr. HUMPHREY they had seen the article, and were considering what action to take, and suggested that Mr. HUMPHREY continue to speak in his campaign appearances concerning what wonderful people Mr. and Mrs. MAC GREGOR were, and the campaign aides would draft out a statement and, perhaps, obtain DAVID GRAVEN as a spokesman to respond to the MAC GREGOR attack. This telephone conversation took place at approximately 4 p.m. to 5 p.m., on September 26, 1970.

At approximately 1 a.m., September 27, 1970, Mr. LEARY stopped at a pay phone in Richfield, Minnesota, near the expressway, and called Mr. HUMPHREY on Mr. HUMPHREY's mobile phone, Number 977-7240, and informed Mr. HUMPHREY that he had that evening spoken with DAVID GRAVEN at a political rally at the Flying Cloud Airport, and had drafted a statement for GRAVEN to use in responding to CLARK MAC GREGOR's attack against Mr. HUMPHREY. At that time, Mr. LEARY

On 11/18/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83

by SAs [REDACTED] b7c Date dictated 11/23/70

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

415

read the draft over the telephone to Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. HUMPHREY responded by making a statement to the effect that maybe they could use a phrase such as, disagreeing without being disagreeable, and use that vein in responding to Mr. MAC GREGOR's attack, and Mr. LEARY suggested that that approach would be fine for Mr. HUMPHREY, but he believed that Mr. GRAVEN should respond with a little harder line.

On Sunday morning, September 27, 1970, at about 9 a.m., Mr. LEARY called DAVID GRAVEN, and arranged for him to make a television appearance at HUMPHREY Campaign Headquarters at about 11 a.m., and respond to Mr. MAC GREGOR's attack on Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. GRAVEN then came to the HUMPHREY Campaign Offices and worked over the statement he was to make, and appeared before television newsmen at the HUMPHREY Campaign Office at Fifth and Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Following this, Mr. GRAVEN went to the Midland Bank Building Campaign Office, where he recorded a statement for radio use and then planned to go to Channel 9 to make a video tape of this same presentation. As Mr. GRAVEN was leaving the Midland Bank Office at about 11:45 a.m., on September 27, 1970, Campaign Aide NORMAN SHERMAN was talking with Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUMPHREY being at his 1970 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota, address, Telephone Number 690-1789, at which time Mr. LEARY played the GRAVEN recording over the phone to Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GRAVEN talked over the telephone with Mr. HUMPHREY for approximately thirty seconds. Following this, Mr. GRAVEN went to Channel 9 and completed his video tape presentation, after which he went to the Minnesota Viking football game.

The only telephone conversation on September 26 and 27, 1970, between Mr. GRAVEN and Mr. HUMPHREY was the one which occurred over Land Line Telephone at approximately 11:45 a.m., on September 27, 1970.

Mr. LEARY then furnished the GRAVEN tape recording and video tape to various radio and television stations throughout Minnesota.

Following WCCO Radio News at 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m., September 27, 1970, Mr. LEARY received a telephone call from Mr. HUMPHREY in which Mr. HUMPHREY inquired as to whether or not Mr. LEARY had heard the WCCO 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. news, in which Mr. MAC GREGOR stated, in effect, that a friend of his had intercepted a telephone call from Mr. HUMPHREY to DAVID GRAVEN where HUMPHREY dictated what GRAVEN was to say.



Inasmuch as the only telephone contact between Mr. GRAVEN and Mr. HUMPHREY concerning this incident took place, as noted above, Mr. HUMPHREY ordered an immediate security check of all telephone lines by the Telephone Company.

Mr. LEARY advised that he, himself, did not actually hear this newscast, however, one of the campaign aides or assistants had made a tape recording of this newscast; however, this tape is no longer available, to his knowledge.

Mr. LEARY stated that on Monday, September 28, 1970, he caused all telephone lines to be checked by the Northwestern Bell Telephone Company, and no evidence was found of any tampering or monitoring devices, and he further noted that no authority had been given to anyone to monitor any HUMPHREY Campaign telephone messages.

On September 29, 1970, Mr. LEARY received a telephone call from "Minneapolis Star" Staff Writer TED SMEBAKKEN, who advised him CLARK MAC GREGOR campaign aides had been in touch with the "Minneapolis Star," and advised that the telephone intercept, referred to by MAC GREGOR, involving Mr. HUMPHREY was actually a radio phone transmission which had been intercepted by a ham radio operator in Bloomington, Minnesota, and Mr. LEARY noted that MAC GREGOR's campaign aides later updated their story, saying that the telephone interception referred to occurred at approximately 1 a.m., on September 27, 1970.

Mr. LEARY advised that at no time did he learn the identity of the ham radio operator, who reportedly intercepted Mr. HUMPHREY's telephone call, nor did he learn the identity of the MAC GREGOR campaign aides who were discussing this matter with the "Minneapolis Star"; however, he assumed it would probably be Campaign Aide JOHN HANKINSON, who is in charge of media relations.

Mr. LEARY stated there is no question in his mind about which telephone call Mr. MAC GREGOR was referring to, and it was without doubt the 1 a.m. telephone call, which call LEARY made from a pay telephone to the HUMPHREY automobile; however, when Mr. MAC GREGOR first made his statement, and referred to a HUMPHREY-GRAVEN telephone call, there was immediate concern, inasmuch as the only call these two individuals were involved in concerning this incident occurred on Land Line Telephone at 11:45 a.m., September 27, 1970.

MP 139-83

4

Mr. LEARY noted that he has had numerous telephone calls from a Mr. DAVISON and a Mr. FOX concerning a possible violation of the law, and he has informed them generally of the facts, as he has related them above. He noted that these individuals were not active in Mr. HUMPHREY's political campaign, and, other than these telephone calls, were unknown to Mr. LEARY.



## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date November 23, 1970

Mr. TED SMEBAKKEN, Staff Writer, "Minneapolis Star," Minneapolis, Minnesota, advised as follows:

Mr. SMEBAKKEN authored an article which appeared in the Tuesday, September 29, 1970, edition of the "Minneapolis Star" concerning a statement by CLARK MAC GREGOR, 1970 candidate for the United States Senate in Minnesota. Mr. MAC GREGOR's statement indicated a telephone conversation of his opponent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, had been intercepted, and MAC GREGOR went on to criticize HUMPHREY based on this intercepted message.

Mr. SMEBAKKEN explained that MAC GREGOR's Campaign Aide, JOHN HANKINSON, had contacted Mr. SMEBAKKEN following Mr. MAC GREGOR's statement and advised Mr. SMEBAKKEN that the telephone intercept of Mr. HUMPHREY's conversation had been made by a ham radio operator from Bloomington, Minnesota; however, Mr. HANKINSON did not advise Mr. SMEBAKKEN the identity of the ham radio operator. It was Mr. SMEBAKKEN's impression from Mr. HANKINSON that this ham radio operator had furnished the results of the telephone intercept directly to Mr. MAC GREGOR at the time of a political fundraiser or speech in Anoka County, Minnesota, on September 27, 1970.

Mr. SMEBAKKEN noted that the original story which he reported indicated a "ham radio operator" had intercepted the message; however, in later contact with people familiar with the operation of ham radio equipment, it had been pointed out that any radio-monitoring equipment would be capable of intercepting a radio telephone message, and it would not necessarily be a ham radio operator. He advised that this matter was clarified in the files of the newspaper; however, it had never been made part of a subsequent news story.

- 13 -

On 11/20/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83  
by SAs [REDACTED] Date dictated 11/23/70

419

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

November 23, 1970

Date

Mr. JOHN HANKINSON, 3824 Glenhurst Avenue, St. Louis Park, Minnesota, was interviewed at 110 South Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and advised as follows:

He is News Director for CLARK MAC GREGOR's Volunteer Committee, Mr. MAC GREGOR having been an unsuccessful 1970 candidate in the state of Minnesota for the United States Senate.

Following a statement by Mr. MAC GREGOR on the 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. WCCO Radio news, September 27, 1970, Mr. HANKINSON contacted Campaign Aide CHARLES A. SLOCUM relative to Mr. MAC GREGOR's statement concerning an interception of a telephone call made by Mr. MAC GREGOR's opponent, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

SLOCUM told HANKINSON that an automobile mechanic and this mechanic's son had apparently been watching television at their residence about 1 a.m., September 27, 1970, and were also listening to radio-monitoring equipment, at which time they overheard a conversation between Mr. HUMPHREY and his campaign aide. Mr. SLOCUM further advised that one of these two individuals furnished the details of the HUMPHREY conversation. SLOCUM made available to HANKINSON the name and telephone number of the automobile mechanic in question.

Mr. HANKINSON did talk with the automobile mechanic, referred to by HANKINSON, and this automobile mechanic did confirm that he had accidentally overheard a telephone conversation on his personal radio-monitoring equipment, while in his home watching television during early morning hours of September 27, 1970, and did recognize the voice as that of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. This automobile mechanic told HANKINSON that the conversation he heard was to the effect that Mr. HUMPHREY was instructing the party on the other end to answer the remarks which had been made by Mr. MAC GREGOR during an earlier speech by Mr. MAC GREGOR on September 26, 1970, criticizing Mr. HUMPHREY.

- 14 -

On 11/20/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83

by SAs [redacted] b7c Date dictated 11/20/70

420

19

MP 139-83

2

Mr. HANKINSON stated it was not clear to him whether or not it was the automobile mechanic or his son who made the actual contact concerning this telephone call. Mr. HANKINSON also stated that he did not know whether or not it was Mr. MAC GREGOR or Mr. SLOCUM who received the information concerning the intercepted telephone conversation.

Mr. HANKINSON advised that he made direct contact with this mechanic inasmuch as it was his, HANKINSON's, responsibility to maintain relations with the news media, and, following this conversation, Mr. HANKINSON contacted a writer at the "Minneapolis Star," Minneapolis, Minnesota, to advise him that the intercept, referred to by Mr. MAC GREGOR, was the result of the radio telephone conversation.

Mr. HANKINSON advised he did not recall the name of the automobile mechanic in question, and recently moved from MAC GREGOR's Volunteer Headquarters to MAC GREGOR's Office at 110 South Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and had no notes pertaining to the identity of this automobile mechanic. He noted that the identity of the automobile mechanic might possibly be recalled by CHARLES SLOCUM, who, until recently, was a full-time staff member of MAC GREGOR's Volunteer Committee; however, Mr. SLOCUM has terminated this employment, and is currently on an automobile vacation in Western United States, which is to last several weeks. Mr. SLOCUM's home address is Madelia, Minnesota.

1

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date November 23, 1970

Mr. JAMES L. BORMANN, News Director, WCCO Radio, 625 Second Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota, made available a dubbing of the taped insert of CLARK MAC GREGOR used on WCCO Radio 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. news Sunday night, September 27, 1970. This statement is as follows:

The voice is that of DAVID GRAVEN, but the words were dictated by HUBERT HUMPHREY. A friend of mine intercepted the telephone call from HUBERT HUMPHREY to DAVID GRAVEN, dictating what DAVID GRAVEN would say. How interesting, every time you expose the weakness of HUBERT HUMPHREY on an issue, he calls it cheap, irresponsible partisan politics. When anyone calls attention to HUBERT HUMPHREY's politically expedient shifts of position, he cries smear. When you point out HUBERT HUMPHREY's disastrous failures of policy and program, he launches a diversionary attack. HUBERT HUMPHREY loves to dish it out, but HUBERT HUMPHREY cannot take it.

- 16 -

On 11/20/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83  
by SAs [REDACTED] b7c Date dictated 11/23/70

428

21



1

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date November 23, 1970

Mr. RICHARD HOLTER, News Editor and Reporter,  
WCCO Radio News, 625 Second Avenue South, Minneapolis,  
Minnesota, advised as follows:

During the WCCO 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. news on September 27, 1970, a statement from DAVID GRAVEN was aired in which Mr. GRAVEN responded to an earlier statement by CLARK MAC GREGOR, 1970 candidate for the United States Senate from the state of Minnesota, in which Mr. GRAVEN defended Senatorial Candidate HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. This statement by Mr. GRAVEN was played fairly early in the newscast, which newscast was on from 10 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. Shortly after the airing of the GRAVEN statement, Mr. HOLTER answered the WCCO News Room telephone and was asked by the party on the other end, "Who is this," at which time HOLTER identified himself and the caller said, "RICH, this is CLARK MAC GREGOR, I have heard the GRAVEN statement, and I have a release to make." Mr. HOLTER has had a number of contacts with Mr. MAC GREGOR, and was certain that MAC GREGOR was, in fact, the individual calling. Mr. MAC GREGOR was very anxious for the statement to be prepared in time to be also aired on the 10 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., September 27, 1970, newscast.

Mr. HOLTER immediately set up recording equipment, and instructed Mr. MAC GREGOR to proceed, which he did, and the recording was completed in time to be included on the 10 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. newscast, September 27, 1970.

Mr. HOLTER listened to the dubbing of Mr. MAC GREGOR's statement of September 27, 1970, and advised that this is the statement which was run on the 10 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. news, on September 27, 1970.

- 17 -

On 11/20/70 at Minneapolis, Minnesota File # MP 139-83

by SAs [REDACTED] b7c Date dictated 11/20/70

423  
26



MP 139-83

On November 23, 1970, Mr. SAM A. SLOCUM, Executive Vice President, Citizens National Bank, Madelia, Minnesota, advised that he is the father of CHARLES A. SLOCUM, who was employed as a campaign aide for CLARK MAC GREGOR during the 1970 election. He advised that his son is presently on vacation in Tucson, Arizona, but he did not know his address at Tucson. He stated that, until his son telephones him or sends him a card as to his location, he will not know how to contact his son. He further stated he did not know of anyone else who would know the current address of his son. He pointed out that his son plans to be on vacation until Christmas, 1970, at which time he will return to Minnesota.

Mr. SLOCUM advised that if he receives any information as to the location of his son he will immediately advise the FBI at Minneapolis, Minnesota.

November 30, 1970

Airtel

1 - Mr. [REDACTED] *h7c*

To: SAC, Minneapolis (139-83)

From: Director, FBI (139-3741) - *3*

*re mlp*  
UNSUB; *EX 107* *REC-52*  
INTERCEPTION OF RADIO TELEPHONE  
TRANSMISSION OF HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ETC.  
IOC  
OO: NP

*h7c*  
Rerep SA [REDACTED] 11/24/70, Minneapolis.


Returned to Minneapolis are the two enclosures to rerep for whatever evidentiary or other use they may have in connection with this investigation. The necessity or desirability of sending these items to the Bureau is not clear, and no examination or review has been made of these enclosures by Bureau.

Minneapolis should promptly complete investigation to identify and interview the unknown individual who is indicated to have happened to listen to the radio telephone transmission involved. As soon as this is accomplished, the matter should be discussed with the U. S. Attorney for his prosecutive opinion and a report of completed investigation submitted. Bureau is to be kept informed of any particularly significant developments.

Enclosures (2)

CAN:mlp  
(4)

Tolson \_\_\_\_\_  
Sullivan \_\_\_\_\_  
Mohr \_\_\_\_\_  
Bishop \_\_\_\_\_  
Casper \_\_\_\_\_  
Callahan \_\_\_\_\_  
Conrad \_\_\_\_\_  
Felt \_\_\_\_\_  
Gale \_\_\_\_\_  
Rosen \_\_\_\_\_  
Soyars \_\_\_\_\_  
Tavel \_\_\_\_\_  
Trotter \_\_\_\_\_  
Tele. Room \_\_\_\_\_  
Holmes \_\_\_\_\_  
Gandy \_\_\_\_\_



*153*  
DEC 8 - 1970  
MAIL ROOM ☒ TELETYPE UNIT ☐

*797*

*DM*

*425*

*24*

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

# Memorandum

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (139-3741)

FROM : SAC, MINNEAPOLIS (139-83) (P)

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS

DATE: 12/10/70

Enclosed for the Bureau are two copies of Minneapolis report of SA [REDACTED] dated 12/10/70.

It has been learned that ROBERT G. RENNER, United States Attorney, Minneapolis, Minnesota, in fact, desires to discuss this matter with the Department of Justice prior to rendering any opinion.

The local press has indicated MAC GREGOR has been appointed by the President as Counsel to the President for Legislative Affairs.

Special Inquiry currently pending at Minneapolis.

2 - Bureau (Enc. 2) ENCLOSURE  
2 - Minneapolis  
CMB:jlj  
(4)

*1-AD, C. D. W.*

*D. V. D.*

*12/15/70*

REC-84

*139-3741-4*

*A. N. I. A. J. G.*  
*(1/15/70)*

6 DEC 1970

58 DEC 21 1970



5010-106-02

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

426

75

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

REPORTING OFFICE <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	OFFICE OF ORIGIN <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	DATE <b>12/10/70</b>	INVESTIGATIVE PERIOD <b>11/25/70 - 12/9/70</b>
TITLE OF CASE  <b>UNKNOWN SUBJECT; Interception of Radio Telephone-Transmission of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70, Minneapolis, Minnesota</b>		REPORT MADE BY <b>b7c</b>	TYPED BY <b>jlj</b>
		CHARACTER OF CASE  <b>INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS</b>	

REFERENCE: Minneapolis report of SA [REDACTED] dated 11/24/70.  
Bureau airtel to Minneapolis dated 11/30/70.

- P -

LEADMINNEAPOLISAT MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Will follow with United States Attorney.

- A\* -  
COVER PAGE

ACCOMPLISHMENTS CLAIMED						<input type="checkbox"/> NONE	ACQUIT- TALS	CASE HAS BEEN:	
CONVIC	AUTO.	FUG.	FINES	SAVINGS	RECOVERIES			PENDING OVER ONE YEAR	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
								PENDING PROSECUTION OVER SIX MONTHS	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
APPROVED <i>[Signature]</i>						SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE		DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW	
COPIES MADE:								131-3741-5	
2 - Bureau (139-3741)								6 DEC 14 1970	
1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota									
2 - Minneapolis (139-63)									
Dissemination Record of Attached Report						Notations			
Agency	1 - CC BAO, CRIMINAL					<i>[Signature]</i>			
Request Recd.	ATTN: MR. JAMES								
Date Fwd.	12/15/70 ROBINSON								
How	61 DEC 14 1970								
By	<i>[Signature]</i>								

COVER PAGE

427

26

EXP. PROC.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to: 1 - USA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Report of: [REDACTED] b7c

Office: MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Date: DECEMBER 10, 1970

Field Office File #: 139-33

Bureau File #: 139-3741

Title: UNINOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
September 27, 1970  
Character: Minneapolis, Minnesota

## INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS

## Synopsis:

CHARLES SLOCUM, Field Organization Director for Congressman CLARK MAC GREGOR during 1970 bid for U. S. Senate, Minnesota, interviewed and advised that at political rally, Bloomington, Minnesota, 9/27/70, talked with man who had overheard radio telephone conversation involving HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and HUMPHREY staff member prior night. Telephone call to effect that DAVID GRAVEN would respond publicly to MAC GREGOR attack on HUMPHREY. SLOCUM introduced this individual to MAC GREGOR at this political rally. SLOCUM recalls identity of individual intercepting radio telephone message and furnishing to MAC GREGOR, however, does not desire to make identity known, believing such information should come from Congressman MAC GREGOR. United States Attorney, Minneapolis, states he desires no further investigation until such time as he has fully reviewed investigation conducted to date and considered prosecutive merit.

- P -

DETAILS:



## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

1

Date December 10, 1970

Mr. CHARLES SLOCUM, 1431 Engelwood, St. Paul, Minnesota, was interviewed at his residence on December 9, 1970, and advised as follows:

He was Field Organization Director for Congressman CLARK MAC GREGOR during the November unsuccessful bid for a Senate seat from the state of Minnesota during the 1970 election. SLOCUM noted that immediately following the election, he went on an extended vacation, returning to St. Paul, Minnesota, on December 8, 1970.

In his capacity as Field Organization Director, SLOCUM served as advance man for MAC GREGOR at various political rallies and meetings. He referred to his notes and noted that on Sunday, September 27, 1970, he took part in a youth rally for MAC GREGOR at Normandale State Junior College, Bloomington, Minnesota. Nearly everyone in attendance at this rally was of high school or college age with the exception of one older individual, approximately 45 years of age, and this older individual talked with SLOCUM at the youth rally concerning a radio message he had over heard during the prior night. The conversation with this older fellow was to the effect that HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, opponent of Congressman MAC GREGOR in the Senatorial election, was going to attack Congressman MAC GREGOR for a statement MAC GREGOR had made concerning HUMPHREY on September 26, 1970. This man explained to SLOCUM that he had been "fooling around" with a radio receiver the prior night and had heard a conversation involving HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and one of HUMPHREY's staff members, which was taking place over a car radio telephone, in which the staff man read a statement to HUMPHREY, and it was indicated that DAVID GRAVEN would make the press release for HUMPHREY criticizing MAC GREGOR.

SLOCUM suggested to this man that he could talk with Congressman MAC GREGOR later this same date at Normandale State Junior College, where Congressman MAC GREGOR was also to appear, and, in fact, this individual did talk with Congressman MAC GREGOR after SLOCUM introduced him to MAC GREGOR later that same day.

- 2 -

On 12/9/70 at St. Paul, Minnesota File # MP 139-83

by SA [REDACTED] h7c Date dictated 12/9/70

Uc                      2C

<sup>2</sup>  
MP 139-83

SLOCUM advised he did not take part or overhear the conversation between the above individual and Congressman MAC GREGOR.

SLOCUM stated that the individual accompanying Congressman MAC GREGOR, at that time, was STEPHEN G. SCHOLLE, attorney, 400 South Second Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota, who may or may not have overheard the conversation between MAC GREGOR and the above individual.

SLOCUM advised he does recall the name of the individual who overheard the HUBERT H. HUMPHREY telephone call, however, SLOCUM does not care to reveal the identity of this individual, stating that such information would be better obtained from Congressman CLARK MAC GREGOR, who is directly involved.

Concerning the individual who intercepted the above telephone call from HUMPHREY, SLOCUM advised this individual was, previous to this incident, unknown to Congressman MAC GREGOR or any member of MAC GREGOR's staff, including himself, and the intercepted telephone call was purely accidental.

MP 139-83

The facts developed during the investigation to date were discussed with United States Attorney ROBERT G. RENNER on December 9, 1970, at which time Mr. RENNER stated that he desired no further investigation be conducted until such time as he has fully reviewed investigative reports concerning investigation conducted to date and considered prosecutive merit in this matter.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

# Memorandum

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (139-3741)

DATE: January 29, 1971

FROM : SAC, MINNEAPOLIS (139-83) (P)

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
September 27, 1970  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS

Re Minneapolis report of SA [REDACTED] dated  
December 10, 1970.

On January 28, 1971, United States Attorney ROBERT  
G. RENNER, Minneapolis, advised he continues to have this  
matter under advisement and stated he desired no further  
investigation at this time.

Minneapolis will continue to follow closely with  
the United States Attorney and keep the Bureau advised.

2-Bureau  
2-Minneapolis  
CMB:dmb  
(4)

ST 101

REC-48

139-3741-6

9 FEB 2 1971



Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

432

Uc

SAC, Minneapolis (139-83)

Uc

February 9, 1971

Director, FBI (139-3741)

1 - Mr. [REDACTED]  
67c

UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
INTERCEPTION OF RADIO  
TELEPHONE TRANSMISSION OF  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
9/27/70  
IOC

Reurlet 1/29/71.

Surep forthwith in order that recent contacts with U. S. Attorney may be furnished to the Department in writing. Insure that reports are submitted regularly in accordance with the 45 day reporting rule.

a

ST-114

REC-2

139-3741-7

FEB 11 1971

433

Tolson \_\_\_\_\_  
Sullivan \_\_\_\_\_  
Mohr \_\_\_\_\_  
Bishop \_\_\_\_\_  
Cannon, C.D. \_\_\_\_\_  
Callahan \_\_\_\_\_  
Conrad \_\_\_\_\_  
Felt \_\_\_\_\_  
Gale \_\_\_\_\_  
Rosen \_\_\_\_\_  
Savel \_\_\_\_\_  
Trotter \_\_\_\_\_  
Tele. Room \_\_\_\_\_  
Holmes \_\_\_\_\_  
Gandy \_\_\_\_\_

CAN:jak  
(4)

86  
62 FEB 18 1971

MAIL ROOM ☐ TELETYPE UNIT ☐

CM



## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

REPORTING OFFICE MINNEAPOLIS	OFFICE OF ORIGIN MINNEAPOLIS	DATE 2/18/71	INVESTIGATIVE PERIOD 12/10/70-1/29/71
TITLE OF CASE UNKNOWN SUBJECT; Interception of Radio Telephone Transmission of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70, Minneapolis, Minnesota		REPORT MADE BY [REDACTED] b7c	TYPED BY mjt
		CHARACTER OF CASE  INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS	

## REFERENCES

Minneapolis report of SA [REDACTED] b7c dated 12/10/70.  
 Minneapolis letter to Bureau dated 1/29/71.  
 Bureau letter to Minneapolis dated 2/9/71.

- P -

## LEAD

## MINNEAPOLIS DIVISION

## AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Will follow with United States Attorney.

Jg

ACCOMPLISHMENTS CLAIMED						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE	ACQUIT- TALS	CASE HAS BEEN:  PENDING OVER ONE YEAR <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO PENDING PROSECUTION OVER SIX MONTHS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
CONVIC.	AUTO.	FUG.	FINES	SAVINGS	RECOVERIES			
APPROVED <i>[Signature]</i>						SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE		
COPIES MADE						DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW		
2 - Bureau (139-3741)						8		
1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota						FEB 22 1971		
2 - Minneapolis (139-83)								
Dissemination Record of Attached Report						Notations		
Agency	1 - CC R.D. CRIMINAL					<i>[Signature]</i> STAT SECT. 434		
Request Recd.	O.C.D. ATTN: MR.							
Date Fwd.	3-3-71 JAMES R. ROBINSON							
How Fwd.	C.D.							
By	[Signature]							

56 MAR - 3 1971

- A\*  
COVER PAGE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to: 1 - USA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Report of: [REDACTED] b7c  
Date: February 18, 1971

Office: Minneapolis,  
Minnesota

Field Office File #: 139-83

Bureau File #: 139-3741

Title: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70,  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Character: INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS

Synopsis: USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota, advised on January 29,  
1971, he has this matter under advisement and desires  
no further investigation at this time.

- P -

DETAILS:

Contact is being maintained in this matter with the office  
of the United States Attorney, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

On January 29, 1971, United States Attorney ROBERT G.  
RENNER advised he has this matter under advisement and desires no  
further investigation at this time.

- 1\* -

435

30

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

REPORTING OFFICE <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	OFFICE OF ORIGIN <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	DATE <b>4-20-71</b>	INVESTIGATIVE PERIOD <b>1/30 - 4/20/71</b>
TITLE OF CASE <b>UNKNOWN SUBJECT; Interception of Radio Telephone Transmission of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70 Minneapolis, Minnesota</b>		REPORT MADE BY <b>SA [REDACTED] b7c</b>	TYPED BY <b>mt</b>
		CHARACTER OF CASE <b>INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS</b>	

REFERENCE:

Minneapolis report of SA [REDACTED] dated 2-18-71.

- P -

LEAD:MINNEAPOLISAT MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Will follow with United States Attorney.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS CLAIMED						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE	ACQUIT- TALS	CASE HAS BEEN:  PENDING OVER ONE YEAR <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO PENDING PROSECUTION OVER SIX MONTHS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
CONVIC.	AUTO.	FUG.	FINES	SAVINGS	RECOVERIES			
APPROVED <i>[Signature]</i>						SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE		
COPIES MADE: 2 - Bureau (139-3741) 1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota 2 - Minneapolis (139-83)						DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW  139-3741- 10 APR 26 1971  EX-115 REC 27 436		
Dissemination Record of Attached Report						Notations		
Agency						<div style="text-align: center;"> <b>SECRET</b>  <i>[Signature]</i> </div>		
Request Recd.								
Date Fwd.								
How Fwd.								
By								

- A\* -  
COVER PAGE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to: 1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Report of: [REDACTED] 174  
Date: 4-20-71Office: MINNEAPOLIS  
MINNESOTA

Field Office File #: 139-83

Bureau File #: 139-3741

Title: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Character: INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONSSynopsis: USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota, advised on 4-20-71, he has  
this matter under advisement and desires no further in-  
vestigation at this time.

- P -

DETAILS:Contact is being maintained in this matter with the  
Office of the United States Attorney, Minneapolis, Minnesota.On April 20, 1971, United States Attorney ROBERT G.  
RENNER advised he has this matter under advisement and desires  
no further investigation at this time.

- 1\* -

437

36

# FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

REPORTING OFFICE <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	OFFICE OF ORIGIN <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	DATE <b>6-25-71</b>	INVESTIGATIVE PERIOD <b>4/21/71 - 6/25/71</b>
TITLE OF CASE <b>UNKNOWN SUBJECT; Interception of Radio Telephone Transmission of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70 Minneapolis, Minnesota</b>		REPORT MADE BY <b>SA [REDACTED]</b>	TYPED BY <b>mt</b>
		CHARACTER OF CASE  <b>INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS</b>	

## REFERENCE:

Minneapolis report of SA **[REDACTED]** dated 4-20-71.

- P -

## LEAD:

MINNEAPOLIS

AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Will follow with the United States Attorney.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS CLAIMED						NONE	ACQUIT- TALS	CASE HAS BEEN:		
CONVIC.	AUTO.	FUG.	FINES	SAVINGS	RECOVERIES	RECOVERIES				
							PENDING OVER ONE YEAR <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO PENDING PROSECUTION OVER SIX MONTHS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO			
APPROVED <i>[Signature]</i>						SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE		DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW		
COPIES MADE: (2) - Bureau (139-3741) 1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota 2 - Minneapolis (139-83)						139-3741-1		JUL 1 1971 REC-38 EX-105		
Dissemination Record of Attached Report						Notations <div style="font-size: 2em; transform: rotate(-15deg); display: inline-block;">STAT. SECT.</div> <div style="font-size: 3em; margin-top: 20px;">438</div>				
Agency	1 - CCRAD, CRIMINAL									
Request Recd.	MR. JAMES R.									
Date Fwd.	7-12-71									
How Fwd.	06 A									
By	[Signature]									

54 JUL 12 1971

- A\* -  
COVER PAGE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to: 1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Report of: [REDACTED] b7c

Date: 6-25-71

Office: Minneapolis, Minnesota

Field Office File #: MP 139-83

Bureau File #: 139-3741

Title: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, 9/27/70  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Character: INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS

Synopsis: USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota, advised he has this matter  
under advisement and desires no further investigation at  
this time.

- P -

## DETAILS:

Contact is being maintained in this matter with the  
Office of the United States Attorney, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

On June 25, 1971, United States Attorney ROBERT G.  
RENNER advised he has this matter under advisement and desires  
no further investigation at this time.

- 1\* -

439

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

REPORTING OFFICE <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	OFFICE OF ORIGIN <b>MINNEAPOLIS</b>	DATE <b>7/21/71</b>	INVESTIGATIVE PERIOD <b>6/26-7/15/71</b>
TITLE OF CASE  <b>UNKNOWN SUBJECT; Interception of Radio Telephone Transmission of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY 9/27/70 Minneapolis, Minnesota</b>		REPORT MADE BY <b>[REDACTED] b7c</b>	TYPED BY <b>bab</b>
		CHARACTER OF CASE  <b>INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS</b>	

REFERENCE

Minneapolis report of SA **[REDACTED] b7c**  
dated 6/25/71.

- C -

*me*

ACCOMPLISHMENTS CLAIMED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE						ACQUIT- TALS	CASE HAS BEEN:  PENDING OVER ONE YEAR <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO PENDING PROSECUTION OVER SIX MONTHS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
CONVIC.	AUTO.	FUG.	FINES	SAVINGS	RECOVERIES		
APPROVED <i>[Signature]</i>						SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE	
COPIES MADE:						DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW	
2 - Bureau (139-3741)						REC-34	
1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota						EX-105	
1 - Minneapolis (139-83)						8 JUL 23 1971	
Dissemination Record of Attached Report						Notations	
Agency	1-RAD, C. am, PLU					<p>STAT. SECT.</p> <p>440</p>	
Request Recd.	ATTN: MR. JAMES						
Date Fwd.	WATTON						
How Fwd.	7-29-71 DGS						
By	620029 1971						

- A\* -  
COVER PAGE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to: 1 - USA, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Report of: [REDACTED] b7c Office: Minneapolis  
Date: July 21, 1971

Field Office File #: 139-83 Bureau File #: 139-3741

Title: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;  
Interception of Radio  
Telephone Transmission of  
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
September 27, 1970  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

~~XXXXXX~~

Character: INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS  
~~XXXXXX~~

Synopsis: USA, Minneapolis, Minn., advised that after thorough review of facts in this case and applicable statutes, he does not find this matter merits Federal prosecution; and he declined prosecution in this matter.

- C -

## Details:

On July 14, 1971, United States Attorney ROBERT G. RENNER, Minneapolis, Minnesota, advised that after thorough review of the facts in this case and applicable statutes, he does not find this matter merits Federal prosecution; and he declined prosecution in this matter.

- 1\* -

441